DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 991 JC 930 172

AUTHOR Smith, Albert B.; Hawthorne, Elizabeth M.
TITLE A National Study of Community College Chief Academic Officers' Perceived Commitment to Instructional Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 28 Apr 93
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community Colleges (73rd, Portland, OR, April 28-May 1, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; *Administrator Attitudes; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Educational Practices; Employment Practices; Faculty Development; *Instructional Effectiveness; National Surveys; Organizational Climate; *Organizational Objectives; Rating Scales; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

In spring 1991, a survey was conducted of chief academic officers (CAO's) at two-year colleges to identify the instructional improvement categories and strategies that received the highest levels of support. The study replicated a 1987 survey of CAO's at four-year institutions and asked respondents to rate their commitment to practices in five areas: campus environment and culture, employment policies and practices, strategic administrative actions, instructional enhancement efforts, and instructional development activities. Responses were also compared to results of the 1987 survey to determine any differences between the perceived commitment of two-year college CAO's and their four-year college counterparts. Surveys were mailed to CAO's at 1,243 public and private two-year colleges, and usable responses were received from 712 administrators. Study findings included the following: (1) in general, responses confirmed limited support and commitment for instructional effectiveness; (2) the highest level of perceived commitment was in the area of campus environment and culture, including such ideas as faculty ownership of the curriculum, faculty confidence in administrative leadership, and a feeling of institutional pride; (3) the lowest level of reported commitment was in regard to instructional development activities, including faculty workshops, colleague support mechanisms, and organized campus units to promote effective teaching; and (4) compared to data from the study of four-year institutions, two-year college CAO's reported higher commitment for all the areas except for employment practices and policies. Recommendations for practice and seven tables showing ratings of commitment to practices per area are included. (Contains 10 references.) (BCY)

ED355991

A National Study of Community College Chief Academic Officers' Perceived Commitment to Instructional Effectiveness

by

Albert B. Smith
Professor and Coordinator
Higher Education Program
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

Elizabeth M. Hawthorne
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. M. Hawthorne
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges, American Association of Community Colleges National Conference, April 28, 1993, Portland, Oregon

JC930172

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study focused on the level of perceived commitment for instructional improvement among two-year college chief academic officers (CAOs). A second aspect of the research was to determine if the level of perceived commitment to instructional effectiveness differed between two-year and four-year CAOs and, if so, in what ways. Data were collected through mail surveys to 1243 two-year college GAOs. Survey data from 712 community college CAOs confirmed limited support and commitment among these respondents for instructional effectiveness in their institutions. A comparison of this data with data collected from an earlier study of 1328 four-year college chief academic officers showed that both types of administrators reported a relatively low level of perceived commitment to activities designed to improve the teaching/learning process. In a number of instances, four-year college and university CAOs reported higher levels of support for specific instructional improvement activities than their two-year college counterparts.

Introduction

Background

Attention to the quality of college teaching has been on the upswing for the last ten years. There has been a dramatic increase of reports, conferences, research, demonstration projects, and publications on this topic. This trend started with the release in 1984 of Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. This report, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, contained 27 recommendations for improving undergraduate education, 15 of which dealt directly or indirectly with ways to improve college teaching. The following year the Association of American Colleges' book on Integrity in the College Curriculum (1985) provided specific recommendations for the preparation of college teachers, the professional development of current faculty, the reward system, and the special obligations college teachers should meet. In 1989 Boyer wrote College: The Undergraduate Experience in America and offered numerous suggestions for improving the teaching/learning process. Boyer recommended that priority be given to teaching not research in our colleges and universities.

More specifically, in the community college field, there has been a similar number of reports, conferences, books, and other publications stressing the need for administrators and faculty to pay more attention to the quality of teaching in their institutions. In its report Building Communities: A Vision For A New Century (1988), the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges made numerous recommendations on how teaching and learning could be improved in our nation's two-year institutions. The Commission stated that

> The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution. Quality instruction should be the hallmark of the movement. Community colleges, above all others, should expect the highest performance in each class and be creative and consistent in the evaluation of the results (p. 28).

Parnell (1990) in his book, Dateline 2000: A New Higher Education Agenda, makes numerous recommendations for improving curriculum and instruction in the community colleges. One of these recommendations illustrates his concern for quality teaching.

> . . . Increasing attention will be given to staff development on the college campus. These renewal efforts will apply to all staff and not just faculty. Even the time honored sabbatical leave for faculty will come under scrutiny as leaders look for more effective and efficient ways to help people grow and develop new competencies to match the fastmoving changes in society (p. 31).

College teaching has become a centerpiece of the agenda for both two-year and four-year colleges.

This emphasis on improving teaching in higher education has been carried on into the nineties. The most widely purchased book in the history of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has been Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate (1990). In this book, Boyer suggests that the

> . . . most important obligation now confronting the nation's colleges and universities is to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar (p. xiii).

He believes that it is time to recognize the full range of faculty talent. In this report, four general views of scholarship are proposed, i.e., discovery, imagination, application, and teaching. Boyer goes on to describe how these activities could be rewarded and promoted in an institution that truly believes that college teaching is the central activity of all colleges and universities.

With the spotlight on undergraduate teaching, community colleges have an opportunity to realize Eells (1931) hopes that the community college would be the leading postsecondary institution modeling and communicating teaching excellence. Now is the time to capitalize on the teaching and learning process in higher education and for the community college to take a leadership role.

Problem and Purposes of the Study

The problem in this study was to determine the level of perceived commitment for instructional improvement among two-year college chief academic officers (CAOs). A second aspect of the study was to determine if the level of perceived commitment to instructional effectiveness differed between two-year and four-year CAOs and, if so, in what ways.

One purpose of this study was to collect base-line data on the existing level of commitment to instructional effectiveness among community college chief academic officers and to suggest areas that deserve attention so substantive changes would be made in the instructional patterns of the nation's two-year colleges. A second purpose was to determine which group had the higher levels of commitment to instructional improvement activities -- two-year or four-year CAOs.

Research Questions

The research questions employed in this study were:

1. What instructional improvement categories/strategies receive the highest levels of support from two-year college CAOs, i.e., employment policies and practices, campus environment and culture, strategic administrative actions, instructional enhancement efforts, or instructional development activities?
2. What specific instructional improvement activities receive the highest levels of support from two-year college CAOs?
3. What are the perceptions of two-year college CAOs with regard to the performance of instructional improvement categories at their colleges?
4. How satisfied are community college CAOs with the amount of personal attention they are able to devote to instructional improvement activities?
5. Which group appears to have the highest level of commitment to instructional improvement activities, two-year or four-year CAOs?
6. What are some good strategies that chief academic officers and other administrators could use to improve the teaching/learning process at their colleges?

Research Design[1]

In this study, we replicated the 1987 survey of chief academic officers of four year colleges and universities conducted by Cochran (1989) in community, technical, and junior

[1]The authors want to express their appreciation to Dr. Leslie Cochran whose original study we have sought to replicate. Dr. Cochran, now President of the University of Akron, has been particularly supportive of this project and has provided us richly with his materials and ideas.

colleges. The original instrument was organized in five areas: employment policies and practices, campus environment and culture, strategic administrative actions, instructional enhancement efforts, and instructional development activities. We added questions on the demographic backgrounds of the respondents (including continuing teaching, presentations, and publications) and their institutions (budgeted costs of faculty development and the promotion of teaching/learning activities) to the original survey. We also included two of Cochran's nine variables[2] regional accreditation and enrollment (from the Higher Education Program Directory), since they were the most applicable to two-year colleges (Cochran, 1989).

Colleges identifying themselves as either public or private two-year colleges in the United States, which were included in the 1987 American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Directory and in the 1990 Higher Education Program Directory, were included in the study. Surveys were sent in the Spring of 1991 to the chief academic officers of the 1243 institutions. We followed Cochran's lead and strongly encouraged the Chief Academic Officers to complete the survey instrument themselves rather than to ask an assistant or colleague to do so.

Two reminder notices were sent out in two-week intervals. A total of 712 usable questionnaires were returned yielding a 57% response rate. The response rate from the very small institutions was lower than for all other institutions, so the findings are slightly biased toward larger institutions.

---

[2]regional accreditation, enrollment, control or affiliation, highest level of offerings, institutional control, land-grant status, enrollment, undergraduate tuition, required fees

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Results

We will report the findings from this survey as follows. First, we will provide an overall look at the five areas of the study in relation to one another followed by an examination of each of the five areas, and close with a comparison between the community college data and the university data reported by Cochran (1989), and concluding remarks.

Overview

There were five questions in each of the five areas of the questionnaire. Respondents indicated their level of commitment to instructional effectiveness for each question using a scale of 1 to 10 (10 was the highest). In Table 2, we show the composite mean responses for each area for our community college study and the Cochran four-year college and university study. The mean scores in the table were calculated by combining the mean responses for each of the five questions for each area. Thus, the highest possible total could be 50, if all five questions in one area were ranked at "10".

[Insert Table 2 about here]

The highest level of perceived commitment for the community colleges CAOs was in the area of campus environment and culture. More specifically, campus culture included ideas such as faculty ownership of the curriculum, the level of intellectual vitality, faculty confidence in administrative leadership, and a shared feeling of institutional pride and each one's impact on teaching and learning. The lowest level of reported commitment by the community college respondents was in the area of instructional development activity. The items in this area focused on workshops for new and continuing full- and part-time faculty

members, colleague support mechanisms, and the presence of an organized unit on campus to promote effective teaching.

Employment policies and practices were also rated moderately high. Employment practices mentioned were evaluating prospective faculty on their teaching ability; the use of regular student evaluations, including the evaluation of teaching as a significant aspect of the tenure review and promotion processes; and the presence of teaching recognition programs.

Well below the support of effective teaching through a conducive campus climate and employment practices were strategic administrative actions such as administrative public pronouncements in favor of excellence in teaching, news releases highlighting exemplary teaching practices, use of research to improve teaching effectiveness, institutional data used to improve teaching, and reinforcement on campus by administrators of the importance of effective teaching. Oddly one would expect that such behaviors would be part of a positive campus culture with respect to an issue like teaching and learning. Similarly, instructional enhancement efforts received a lower perceived CAO commitment. These items focused on different ways in which institutions fostered effective teaching including using librarians, released time and financial awards, funds for conferences, faculty development activities, high visibility to curriculum development, and administrative emphasis on the use of research to support good teaching. These data suggest that while community colleges report that they have environments conducive to good teaching and that their employment practices reinforce the idea of good teaching, their practices do not always follow the rhetoric and intangibles.

We now turn to an analysis of each of the five areas. For each of the five areas, we collapsed responses on the scale for each of the five questions to look at high commitment

responses (8, 9, 10) and low commitment responses (1, 2, 3), as well as mean responses. In addition for our data, we show those areas in which respondents indicated that the questions did not apply to their institutions, whenever the "not-applicable (N/A)" responses exceeded 10%, since each question indicated an area of activity or values that have been hypothesized to contribute to effective teaching.

Instructional Development Activities

Instructional development activities for faculty do signal to the most naive observer an institutional commitment to teaching effectiveness. Support must be nurtured and sustained by the highest administrative officers of a college or university; but faculty involvement in the development of such efforts is essential for desirable outcomes. These data clearly show that the community colleges are doing less in the area of improving instruction through faculty development activities than in any other area addressed by the survey. Let us turn, however, to examine in more detail the extent to which the CAOs reported activity in each component of this section.

The five areas of instructional development activity to which the Chief Academic Officers were asked to respond were the presence of support mechanisms for teaching and learning, e.g., mentors; the presence of workshops on teaching/learning and effective instruction for continuing full-time faculty, new full-time faculty, and new part-time faculty; and the promotion of effective instruction by an organized unit. The collapsed percentage ratings and mean responses for this section are reported in Table 3 for both studies.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

The greatest extent of commitment to instructional development activities among the two-year college respondents was in the area of support mechanisms for teaching and learning (45 percent and a mean of 6.7). These mechanisms could be mentors, chairperson monitoring, and so forth. Closely following the presence of support mechanisms are campus-wide seminars on teaching and learning. These could be one day "welcome back to school" professional days or extensive year-long programs.

A high level of commitment to providing institutional support for effective teaching to part-time faculty is reported by fewer than a quarter of the respondents as is the presence of an organized unit on campus. Indeed, 27 percent indicated that this area was not applicable or pertinent to their colleges. Furthermore, elsewhere in the survey we specifically asked if the CAOs' campuses had teaching and learning improvement centers. Only 98 respondents indicated affirmatively; since the majority (72 percent) of the directors of these centers were reported as not having faculty/staff development responsibilities, one might assume that many respondents were reporting about learning resources centers directed towards students rather than faculty and staff development centers. Here it is possible that there is a different interpretation of the terminology by the community college respondents. A center for teaching and learning on a university campus would most likely be a faculty development center, whereas on community college campuses it is likely to mean a learning resources center for students. Still the small proportion of colleges that have such units suggests sporadic efforts to support teaching and learning rather than a sustained, institution-wide commitment represented by this kind of unit.

Thus the most frequently reported instructional development activities for the community colleges were support mechanisms and campus-wide seminars; both reported at less than enthusiastic or high levels of perceived commitment. Given that 98 percent of the respondents said that the primary mission of their institution was teaching, this is a dismal state for community college teaching. In another part of our study, the CAOs reported being modestly satisfied with the personal attention given to instructional development activities (mean 6.4/10) and gave a slightly higher rating (mean 6.7/10) of their institution's performance in this area. This could mean that the CAOs are satisfied with less than optimal performance or the limited effort reported nevertheless yields a satisfactory level of teaching at their institutions.

Instructional Enhancement Efforts

Virtually two thirds (65%) of the community college CAOs indicated that funds were available in their institutions for conferences on instructional improvement, faculty development activities, and the like. Following the extent of availability of funds for instructional improvement was that high visibility was given to curriculum development (46 percent). Released time and financial awards to improve instructional effectiveness were cited by 39 percent of the community college respondents. Least utilized to enhance instruction were librarians, an opportunity that Cochran specifically calls for in his book. Here, too, even when instructional resource centers were in place, the link with the faculty appears to be weak.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Of particular interest, respondents reported low levels of emphasis on the ways research and scholarly activity were used to reinforce or support effective teaching (mean of 5.0). While community college faculty are generally not expected to conduct scholarly research in their academic fields (some even discourage this kind of effort), action research on teaching and learning (e.g., Cross, 1988) is within the scope of appropriate activity for a teaching institution; yet these administrators apparently do not promote these efforts or the two-year college respondents interpreted the question differently. Still, the lower level of interest in the use of research to reinforce or support effective teaching among the two-year college respondents is corroborated by reports of their recent publications and presentations, which address less about teaching and learning than administrative concerns, including planning, budgeting, etc.

Finally, respondents reported that they were moderately satisfied with the level of their institutions' performance in instructional enhancement efforts (6.8/10) and with the amount of personal attention they devote to each area (6.6/10). Both mean responses are short of enthusiastic endorsement, but still more positive than the level of institutional commitment might merit.

Employment Policies and Practices

The overall level of commitment to improving teaching can usually be measured by administrator and faculty commitment to hiring practices that promote effective instruction. Actual employment decisions influence much of what is said and done about teaching on both two-year and four-year college campuses. The data in Table 5 show that community college CAOs perceive themselves as having a surprisingly low commitment to certain employment

policies and practices that support instructional effectiveness. The greatest extent of perceived commitment in this area is to the student evaluation of classroom instruction. Eighty-four (84) percent of the community college CAOs expressed a high commitment to this activity. However, there was only a moderate level of commitment to look at teaching effectiveness as part of the tenure process with 63 percent of the respondents giving this item a high rating.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Also, less than half of the responding community college CAOs (only 40 percent) appeared to have a strong commitment to teaching recognition programs, including such practices as grants, awards, etc. A mere 12 percent of the respondents felt that this item was "not applicable" to their situation. These were unexpected findings. We had expected to find greater levels of support among administrators for evaluating teaching effectiveness as part of the hiring, tenure, and promotion processes. One wonders if faculty will continue to strive to improve their teaching if their efforts are not regularly evaluated and rewarded by the CAO and his/her department or division chair.

The CAOs seemed to be fairly satisfied with their performance in the employment and practices area (mean of 7.1/10). They gave a somewhat higher rating to their institution's performance in this area (mean of 7.4/10). Even with these satisfaction and performance levels, it would appear that the level of attention given to appropriate evaluation and recognition of teaching activities could be substantially increased in two-year colleges.

Strategic Administrative Actions

Table 6 clearly shows the need for extraordinary action on the part of most community college chief academic officers if teaching is to receive increased attention. The first three strategic actions in this table are a straight-forward way for administrators to demonstrate their commitment to teaching. The last two strategies in this table will cost administrators more in time and resources. In a sense, if the last two actions are taken, the first three will not matter as much.

The importance of the first three actions studied here is that the administrator sets the agenda for the college by defining it and re-enforcing it. This is how values within an organization are fostered (see Clark, 1986 and Schein, 1986). The last two actions in Table 6 demonstrate tangible organizational commitment giving reality to values. One without the other is problematic and likely to result in little impact.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

Specifically, these data show that 66 and 60 percent of the CAOs rated themselves as having a relatively high commitment to the first two items in this table, emphasizing teaching in speeches and presentations and feeling that other academic administrators regularly reinforce teaching. These were two of five statements that received the highest mean ratings in our survey, (7.9 and 7.6 respectively), however, these were among the least tangible and probably least action-oriented statements in this and other categories. The mean rating of 6.4 on the use of news releases and articles emphasizing exciting classroom activities shows that only some attention is being given to this area. The mean ratings of 5.4 on the collection of data to improve instruction and 3.9 on research designed to improve instruction should be an

embarrassment to chief academic officers and two-year colleges that pride themselves as being America's premier teaching institutions at the postsecondary level. The 26 percent and 12 percent of chief academic officers rating themselves as having a good to excellent level of commitment on these last two items are to be commended. However, the low level of commitment expressed by many other CAOs represent a serious indictment of these leaders and suggests a possible lack of interest in organized efforts to improve instruction on their campuses. Fourteen percent of the respondents felt that an item related to regular research studies designed to improve teaching on their campuses was not applicable to the situation and 34 percent of the chief academic officers rated the use of research to improve instruction at their lowest level of commitment in relationship to all other items in this study. We find it somewhat amazing that after almost 100 years of history, community college administrators are willing to commit so little to the collection of data to improve the teaching/learning process.

Furthermore, the chief academic officers reported being satisfied with their performance in the use of strategic administrative actions to improve instruction (mean of 7.1/10). They are not as satisfied with their institutions's performance in this area as evidenced by a mean response of 6.9/10.

Campus Environment and Culture

The creation of a positive teaching/learning environment requires constant administrative and faculty attention. Many variables affect the development of the campus environment and culture. We used five indicators to assess the general level of the campus teaching environment.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

Table 7 provides the overall group ratings and mean scores for these indicators. As a group of statements, the level of commitment to campus environment and culture ranked highest out of the five categories in this study. The item regarding faculty ownership of the curriculum (mean of 8.0) ranked as the second highest item out of the 25 statements in our study. Sixty-six percent of the chief academic officers placed this item in the high category rating of 8, 9, or 10. This is the only statement, however, that received a high level of commitment among these five items. Across the nation there appears to be only a moderately positive environment for sustaining the primary function of teaching in community colleges. Less than half (48 percent) of the CAO's in two-year colleges, responding to this study, perceived a level of intellectual vitality and morale on their campuses that they felt was conducive to effective instruction.

These perceptions present numerous challenges for faculty, particularly when we found that CAOs in this study showed their highest level of satisfaction with their personal attention to the area of campus environment and culture (mean of 7.2/10). They also perceived their institutions as having the highest level of institutional performance in this area (mean of 7.4/10. There appears to be plenty of room for more administrator and faculty action in this area. CAOs should work to achieve higher levels of institutional pride among faculty and a greater sense of confidence in their own instructional leadership.

A Comparison of the Community Colleges and Universities

Community colleges and four-year colleges and universities have different missions, and therefore, can be expected to emphasize, reward, and produce different outcomes. Still, they

all share the responsibility for educating students to leave their institutions able to function successfully in their social, professional, and economic roles in life. Thus we were very interested in examining how community colleges--the teaching institutions in American higher education--compared to the four year colleges and universities in their efforts to offer and support effective instruction to their students.

We think that the column in Table 2 showing the mean ratings of both responding groups on each of the five areas is revealing. The highest composite mean rating, indicating the extent of support for effective instruction, was the university CAOs commitment to supportive employment practices, essentially evaluation and recognition of high quality teaching (39.6 out of a possible 50). Well below that was the level of commitment to instructional development activities by the university CAOs (composite mean rating of 18.8) and two-year college CAOs (composite mean rating of 27.6). These are not ringing endorsements of the importance of institutional support for teaching; thus raising serious concerns about the overall commitment to teaching and learning in American postsecondary education. Equal or near-equal (in the two respondent groups) ratings were reported in the areas of campus culture, strategic action, and enhancement efforts. One has to wonder what is going on in the large proportion of institutions rating these kinds of attitudes, values, and activities so low on their campuses!

However, the greatest difference between the two respondent groups was in the composite mean response to the area of Instructional Development Activities. From Table 2 the community colleges' composite mean response was 27.6 out of a possible 50 as compared to the universities' response of 18.8. While neither level of CAO commitment is impressive,

the difference at least confirms to some degree the community colleges academic administrators greater commitment to teaching and learning. While both types of administrators (combining four-year colleges and universities into one classification corresponding to Cochran) are similar in the ranking of the five different instructional development activities, the community colleges CAOs were more committed to providing support mechanisms and campus-wide activities on instructional effectiveness than the CAOs in universities.

The university CAOs on the other hand provided teaching assistant training to a greater extent than the community colleges offered orientation to new part-time instructors. Given the high proportion of part-time instructors in community colleges and the large number of teaching assistants teaching comparable level classes in the universities, this is a shared shortcoming that all of the types of institutions included in these studies are in need of addressing. Further, in this area, the universities orient new faculty in teaching and learning infrequently (20 percent response) and the community colleges do more (30 percent response), but neither response is deserving of substantive credit.

The two respondent groups were modestly different on employment policies and practices. The university CAOs showed a much higher level of perceived commitment to the recognition of teaching effectiveness in the tenure and promotion process (88 percent to 63 and 86 percent to 51) than the community college CAOs. They also described a higher level of commitment to evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness as a significant and integral aspect of the initial hiring process. These findings are actually the opposite of what we had expected to find. With the heavy emphasis on teaching in most two-year colleges, we

had expected the CAOs there to stress teaching in the tenure and promotion process more than their counterparts in four-year colleges and universities. It may be that four-year college and university CAOs express a high level of commitment to teaching when in fact they reward primarily the research and publication activities of their faculties. Future studies in this area should probably seek to measure faculty perceptions of CAO commitment, this would provide a more complete picture of support for teaching on both two-year and four-year campuses. If community colleges are not using teaching effectiveness in their decision making on tenure and promotion, then what are they using? On the other hand, many community colleges do not have a tenure or promotion system, so responses to these questions should be interpreted with care.

Implications and Conclusions

The data from both studies reveal a profound lack of institutional attention to effective instruction. Apparently institutions have left this responsibility to the initiative, training, and talent of the faculty. While we in no way want to suggest that faculty are not up to the task, there are many institutional conditions that faculty require to be effective.

First, faculty members in higher education, as a rule, have no preparation for teaching. Only a small proportion of teaching assistants receive some training in the universities suggesting that other graduate students receive none or little. We do note that more and more universities are providing instruction on teaching and learning to teaching assistants, but such is not the case universally. Sufficient anecdotal evidence is available to indicate that, in many cases, graduate advisors in the disciplines discourage their graduate students from such

"distracting" pursuits, so that graduate students can and will focus exclusively on the content and methods of their fields.

Second, the most dedicated and talented faculty members need to have institutional support for their work. What does this mean? First, it means a workload that allows time to plan, to change, to adapt, and to work with students. Second, it means information that will aid faculty in their responsibilities, e.g., institutional research data, research findings on teaching and learning, and the like. Third, it means administrative encouragement through recognition--internal and external attention--of the value and importance of teaching and learning and the accomplishments of students and faculty. So many faculty members in community colleges, especially, express discouragement that their administrators do not care as much about teaching and learning as they do about special projects or other interests. If few pay attention specifically to instruction, the faculty will become apathetic, indifferent, and alienated. These data clearly show that this is a real issue that administrators have to address. Fourth, integrating part-time faculty into the institution through introductory and continuing seminars and workshops on effective instruction is essential. Part-timers do not share the daily world with colleagues in education as a rule; they need to find the voice for pedagogy and channels for expression.

A fourth conclusion is that continuing faculty, full-time and part-time, need to have a forum for substantive discussion of teaching and learning issues. The faculty can define the forum, can design the forum, and can lead the forum, but the support of the institution is essential for this kind of continuing exploration and development to become one with the institution. Each institution has to devise its own ways of enhancing teaching and learning.

Fifth, institutional leadership should bring in diverse members of the institutional community to contribute to teaching effectiveness. Specifically, librarians and learning resource center staff, including educational technology specialists, should be active participants with the faculty in curriculum design and in the development of coursework.

Sixth, administrators should link evaluation with development opportunities so that evaluation is viewed as and used as an improvement tool rather than a punitive measure. Faculty should be part of the development of the evaluation system used.

Finally, we would suggest that administrators and faculty seek routine communication channels--face-to-face--to exchange information, of course, but also to build a shared vision of the institution. For example, we asked to what extent "faculty have a clear sense of ownership of the curriculum and other instructional concerns." The community college respondents indicated that they believed that the faculty had a high sense of ownership (mean of 8.0). One wonders, however, if their faculty members would answer the same question similarly. More institutional research on shared views within an institution would illuminate the efforts of all groups on a college campus and be a firm foundation for fostering open discussion bringing together multiple perspectives.

References

Association of American Colleges (1985). Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, B. R. (1986). The organizational saga in higher education. In ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education. Third Edition. Marvin W. Peterson, Editor. Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

Cochran, L. H. (1989). Administrative Commitment to Teaching. Cope Girardeau, Missouri: STEP UP, Inc.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988). Building Communities: A Vision For A New Century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Cross, P. and Angelo, T. (1988). A Handbook on Classroom Assessment Techniques. Ann Arbor, Michigan: NCRIPTAL.

Eells, W. C. (1931). The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Parnell, D. 91990). Dateline 2000: A New Higher Education Agenda. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Schein, E. H. (1986). What you need to know about organizational culture." Training and Development Journal. 40:1, 30-33.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (October, 1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Table 1

Responses by Institutional Enrollment Size

Institutional Enrollment	Number Responding	Response Rate %
<200	21	43
200-499	32	36
500-999	86	63
1000-2499	173	58
2500-4999	176	68
5000-9999	126	68
10000-19999	68	60
20000 +	19	61
Missing	11	
Total	712	57%

Table 2

Chief Academic Officers and Their Commitment to Various Instructional Effectiveness Strategies

Area	Composite Mean Scores
Campus Environment and Culture	36.8 (36.7)
Employment Policies and Practices	34.7 (39.6)
Strategic Administrative Actions	31.2 (29.7)
Instructional Enhancement Efforts	31.2 (29.2)
Instructional Development Activities	27.6 (18.8)

*Composite mean scores in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.

Table 3

Perceived Commitment of Instructional Development Activities in Support of Instructional Effectiveness

Items	% Rating 1, 2 or 3	Means	% Rating 8, 9 or 10
The campus maintains various colleague support mechanisms (e.g., mentors, chairperson monitoring, etc.) to promote and support effective instruction.	9 (23)*	6.7 (5.8)*	45 (31)
Faculty seminars, workshops, and conferences on teaching and learning are conducted on campus.	12 (21)	6.6 (5.8)	42 (30)
Workshops/seminars on effective instruction are conducted for new full-time faculty members.	21 (42)	5.5 (4.7)	30 (20)
Seminars/workshops on effective instruction are conducted for new part-time faculty members.	29 (33)	4.8 (5.3)	22 (27)
Effective instruction is promoted by an organized unit or program (e.g., center for teaching and learning). (N/A = 27%)	23 (42)	4.0 (5.2)	22 (20)

*Percentages and means in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.

Table 4

Perceived Commitment of Instructional Enhancement Efforts in Support of Instructional Effectiveness

Items	% Rating 1, 2 or 3	Means	% Rating 8, 9 or 10
Funds are available to support instructional improvement items (e.g., conferences on instructional effectiveness, faculty development activities, and other instructional improvement items.	5 (10)*	7.8 (7.0)*	65 (49)*
Curriculum development activities are given high visibility to illustrate their importance.	8 (13)	7.0 (6.5)	46 (40)
Released time and financial awards are used to promote teaching improvement.	16 (17)	6.0 (6.1)	39 (34)
Librarians are used to promote effective instruction on campus.	18 (20)	5.4 (6.0)	27 (33)
Administrators regularly emphasize the ways research and scholarly activity can be used to reinforce or support effective teaching.	24 (28)	5.0 (5.4)	19 (26)

*Percentages and means in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.

Table 5

Perceived Commitment of Employment Policies and Practices in Support of Instructional Effectiveness

Items	% Rating 1, 2, or 3	Means	% Rating 8, 9 or 10
Classroom instruction is regularly evaluated by students.	3 (2)*	8.8 (9.1)*	84 (88)*
A faculty member's teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the initial hiring process.	4 (4)	7.5 (8.0)	58 (70)
Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the tenure process. N/A = 22%)	3 (1)	6.7 (9.1)	63 (88)
Teaching recognition programs (grants, awards, etc.) that promote effective teaching are available. (N/A = 12%)	16 (14)	5.9 (7.0)	40 (51)
Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the promotion process. (N/A = 27%)	7 (2)	5.8 (8.9)	51 (86)

*Percentages and means in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.

Table 6

Perceived Commitment of Strategic Administrative Actions in Support of Instructional Effectiveness

Items	% Rating 1, 2 or 3	Means	% Rating 8, 9, or 10
The importance of teaching is emphasized by upper level administrators in speeches and public presentation.	4 (3)*	7.9 (8.1)*	66 (73)*
Academic administrators across the campus regularly reinforce the importance of effective teaching.	3 (4)	7.6 (7.6)	60 (62)
News releases and articles are regularly used to focus attention on exciting classroom activities.	12 (20)	6.4 (5.8)	36 (28)
Institutional data on teaching effectiveness are collected and used as a means to improve instruction on campus.	21 (28)	5.4 (5.4)	26 (23)
Research designed to improve the quality of instruction is regularly conducted on campus. (N/A = 14%)	34 (42)	3.9 (4.5)	12 (14)

*Percentages and means in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.

Table 7

Perceived Commitment of the Campus Environment and Culture in Support of Instructional Effectiveness

Items	% Rating 1, 2 or 3	Means	% Rating 8, 9 or 10
Faculty have a clear sense of ownership of the curriculum and other instructional concerns	1 (2)*	8.0 (8.3)*	66 (74)*
There is a shared feeling of institutional pride that stimulates effective classroom performance.	4 (5)	7.5 (7.4)	58 (56)
The level of intellectual vitality and morale on campus is conducive to effective instruction.	4 (3)	7.2 (7.3)	48 (53)
There is a clear sense of administrative stability that allows faculty to focus on the instructional process.	4 (8)	7.2 (7.1)	54 (53)
The faculty have a clear sense of confidence in the upper administrative leadership that fosters effective instruction	2 (7)	6.9 (6.9)	42 (43)

*Percentages and means in parentheses represent the responses to Cochran's (1989) study of 1328 chief academic officers of four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1987-88.